REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 1, 2008. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21 and 23-32 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, 26, 29 and 30 are amended herein. Claims 2, 8, 13-16, 18 and 22 are canceled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to have been introduced to the application by this amendment. Claim 1 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Specifically, the word, "fist," has been corrected to spell "first." Other changes to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, FIG. 4, original paragraphs [08], [17], [64] and [68]-[71], and original Claims 2, 8, 18, and 22.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Claims 26, 29 and 30, which specified the Microsoft® Windows® CE operating system as the thin client's operating system, were rejected because of the use of trademarks in the claim. Without conceding the correctness of this rejection, Applicant has amended Claims 26, 29 and 30 to avoid the use of trademarks, and to specify that the operating system is designed for generic remote computing devices. The changes to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example,

original paragraphs [06] and [16]. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 18, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,295,556 B1 ("Falcon") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0003371 A1 ("Coulthard"); Claims 3, 9, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091850 ("Perholtz"); Claims 4, 10, 25, 27, 28 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,039,709 ("Beadle"); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,181,524 ("Lele"); Claims 6, 12, 20 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0183831 ("Ritchy"); Claims 11 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of Beadle and Lele; and Claims 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Falcon in view of Coulthard and further in view of Beadle and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0055917 ("Muraca"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The applied references are not understood to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 1, particularly with respect to at least the following features:

the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon <u>directly on the desktop</u>;

selecting the active area allows a new connection window to appear and, upon designating a new connection, allows a second connection icon for a second application to be displayed <u>directly on the desktop</u>; and

the desktop is operative to display at least a first <u>application icon</u> directly on the desktop <u>at the remote computing device</u>, wherein the first application icon represents an application available <u>for execution on the first local computing device</u>.

By way of illustration, without limiting the scope of the claims, Applicant describes in the application various problems associated with traditional interfaces: "The original desktop shell for the Microsoft® Windows® family of operating systems, known as Microsoft® Explorer, does <u>not</u> allow a user to add, edit or delete connections between a remote computing device and a local computing device <u>from the desktop shell</u>. For instance, users of applications such as Citrix®, which operates on the Microsoft® Windows® CE operating system, must use a specialized connection manager interface to administer each connection, and <u>existing connections cannot be displayed on the desktop</u>. <u>Since the desktop is the primary interface between the operating system and the user, the user must currently make additional burdensome steps in order to view or edit their connections</u>." See paragraph [07] of Present Application (emphasis added). Applicant is the first to solve these problems.

Turning to the applied references, Falcon discloses a method and system for configuring computers to connect to networks using network connection objects. See Falcon, Abstract. To facilitate the use of the connection objects, a connection manager 78 interfaces with the user through a folder 96 and manages the connection objects. Network connections generally appear

11

as icons in the <u>connection folder</u> 96. See Falcon, FIGS. 5 and 6; col. 6:29-33. These icons are

<u>not</u> and <u>cannot be displayed directly on the desktop</u>. Falcon's icons are in a connection folder 96

in FIG. 6, <u>not directly on the desktop</u>. In fact, folder 96 of FIG. 6 also displays an "X" on the top

right corner because folder 96 appears as a window, and not as a desktop. Therefore, like the

prior art described in paragraph [07] of the application, Falcon has the same problems (e.g.,

traditional methods do <u>not</u> allow a user to add, edit or delete connections between a remote

computing device and a local computing device <u>from the desktop shell</u>. Because the traditional

connections <u>cannot be displayed directly on the desktop,</u> users must make additional burdensome

steps in order to view or edit their connections). Thus, Falcon does not disclose or suggest that

the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon <u>directly on the desktop</u> and a

second connection icon for a second application to be displayed <u>directly on the desktop</u>.

Furthermore, Falcon does not disclose or suggest that the desktop is operative to display

at least a first <u>application icon</u> directly on the desktop <u>at the remote computing device</u>, wherein

the first application icon represents an application available <u>for execution</u> on the <u>first local</u>

<u>computing device</u>. Falcon does not disclose any application icons, let alone disclose the display

of at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device. The

icons shown in FIG. 6 of Falcon illustrate icons for connection, and <u>not</u> for <u>an application</u>. In

fact, the Examiner concedes that Falcon does not disclose that the first connection icon is for a

first application and the second connection icon is for a second application. Additionally, Falcon

makes <u>no</u> mention of an application icon <u>at a first device</u> representing an application available

for execution <u>on a second device</u>. Thus, Falcon does not disclose or suggest that the desktop is

operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote

computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device.

Coulthard does not remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Falcon. Coulthard discloses a common connection registry of connections to remote systems for use in an integrated development environment. See Coulthard, Abstract. Connections are displayed in a remote systems explorer view 1110. See Coulthard, FIG. 11. This is not a desktop. The remote systems explorer view is a single view for exploring objects on remote servers. The remote systems explorer view is a tree-view that allows the user to manage remote connections. See Coulthard, paragraph [0098]. In other words, the remote systems explorer view only allows a user to view the remote connections, very much like the connection folder of Falcon. Coulthard's connections are not and cannot be displayed directly on the desktop. Coulthard's connections are shown in a remote systems explorer view, not directly on the desktop. Therefore, like the prior art described in paragraph [07] of the application, Coulthard has the same problems (e.g., traditional methods do not allow a user to add, edit or delete connections between a remote computing device and a local computing device from the desktop shell. Because the traditional connections cannot be displayed directly on the desktop, users must make additional burdensome steps in order to view or edit their connections). Thus, Coulthard does not disclose or suggest the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop and a second connection icon for a second application to be displayed directly on the desktop.

Furthermore, Coulthard does not disclose or suggest that the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first

13

local computing device. As shown in FIG. 11 of Coulthard, the remote accessing tool nodes 1130, 1140 and 1150 are displayed on the remote systems explorer view 1110. As discussed above, the remote systems explorer view is not a desktop. Therefore, the remote accessing tool nodes of Coulthard are not displayed directly on the desktop. Additionally, the remote accessing tool nodes of Coulthard are displayed at a first system and represent tools available for execution at the same first system. Coulthard discloses a processor (at a first system), and a network interface by which the processor can access one or more remote systems (see Remote Systems 1120, 1122, 1124 in FIG. 11) across a connected or wireless network. These remote systems are not the first system. An integrated development environment (IDE) executes on the processor (at the first system), and the tools are within the IDE (at the first system). See Coulthard, FIG. 11 and paragraph [0050]. Therefore, the remote accessing tool nodes 1130, 1140 and 1150 of FIG. 11 are displayed on the remote systems explorer view of an IDE of a **first system**, and represent tools available for execution on the **same first system** (**not** a **different** system such as Remote Systems 1120, 1122 or 1124). Accordingly, Coulthard does not disclose or suggest the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device (a first device), wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (a second device).

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent Claim 1, which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Similar arguments apply to other independent Claims 7, 17, and 21.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from independent Claim 1, 7, 17, or 21 discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is

14

deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be contacted at the address and telephone number set forth below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub
Registration No. 39,266

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:lmt
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: December 22, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**